

**International Neuropsychological Society
Board of Governors Meeting
February, 2021**

February 1, 2020: Part I

Present:

Officers: Margaret O'Connor (President), Skye McDonald (Incoming President), Ida Sue Baron (President-Elect), Ozioma Okonkwo (Treasurer), Celiane Rey-Casserly (Secretary), Marc Norman (Executive Director – Ex Officio)

Members at Large: Juan Carlos Arango Lasprilla, Miriam Beauchamp, Desiree Byrd, Robin Green, Ashok Jansari, Sarah MacPherson, Sanne Schagen, Glenn Smith, Mieke Verfaellie

Visitors: Jon Evans, Alberto Fernandez, Sallie Baxendale, Fiona Kumfor, Vicki Anderson, Anthony Stringer (partial attendance)

1. Presidential Welcome/Call to Order (O'Connor)

Margaret O'Connor called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm EST. She reviewed the structure of the board meeting. She welcomed new members to the Board of Governors, Skye McDonald, President, Ida Sue Baron, Incoming President, Jon Evans, President-Elect, Alberto Fernandez, Secretary and incoming members at large, Sallie Baxendale, Shawn McClintock, and Fiona Kumfor. She also welcomed incoming Committee Chairs, Natalia Ojeda de Pozo (Global Engagement), Christian Salas Riquelme (Awards), Ben Hampstead (Continuing Education) and Cynthia Honan (Conflict of Interest). Participants in the meeting introduced themselves and their roles in INS.

M. O'Connor provided some reflections on the past year. She described how the world changed and how our lives were transformed in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. She also commented that the COVID-19 pandemic should have served as a unifying influence in our communities. Instead, in the past year we have seen acts of racism and violence and the pandemic has further highlighted the disparities in disease burden and access to health care across diverse communities. M. O'Connor noted that these events have also been a catalyst for change for the INS. The Society has expanded and refined the production of educational webinars and virtual meetings, fostered international connections, and formed task forces to help deliver on our goals. She noted that the Board would hear later about the work of the Justice and Equity Task Force, the INS Mentoring Program, and the by-laws revision. She thanked the officers for the monthly conversations and Dr. Norman for all his work for the Society. She noted that INS is in great hands with Dr. Skye McDonald.

2. Call for New Business.

There was no new business.

3. Executive Director Report (Norman)

a. General Updates *M. Norman expressed his appreciation to M. O'Connor and her leadership over the past year. He reminded the board members of their fiduciary responsibility related to the governance of the Society. He encouraged all to vote on the issues discussed. He noted that the agenda includes both assent and action items. For informational items, the committee chairs will not highlight everything in the agenda and focus on the main issues that need to be discussed with the board. M. Norman also noted that the Society remains very strong with respect to members and finances; membership has remained stable with some fluctuations over the past three years. With respect to the February Virtual San Diego meeting, there are 1,361 registrations so far. He noted that some speakers have donated their honoraria to support INS initiatives. In addition, INS will be applying to be a continuing education sponsor for the state of New York that is now only recognizing continuing educational credits only through its own system, not APA.*

b. Collaborations *M. Norman reviewed collaborations that are proceeding with a group of neurologists in Cameroon that is seeking INS support in developing initiatives in the area of dementia. O. Okonkwo and members of the Dementia Special Interest Group participated in a call with this group. M. Norman also summarized a potential collaboration with folks from the United Arab Emirates and the International League against Epilepsy (ILAE). The plan is to work together on a small workshop.*

c. Cultural Neuropsychology Council *M. Norman reported on a request from the Cultural Neuropsychology Council that is seeking delegates from neuropsychology organizations. The outline of their proposal is in the agenda. M. Norman noted that he did not know much about the group. D. Byrd noted that she attended an initial meeting of the group and it seems like they are trying to consolidate people who have an interest in cultural neuropsychology. The relationship between this proposal and the work of the INS Cultural Neuropsychology SIG was not clear. Board members agreed that more information was needed to understand this proposal. The engagement of this group with neuropsychology globally was not clarified. G. Smith suggested that this effort fits best in the Clinical Neuropsychology Specialty Council since it is US focused. He also mentioned that INS should not engage this group except through inter-organizational conveners, as to do otherwise can contribute to fractionation in neuropsychology. M. O'Connor concluded the discussion and noted that more information would be gathered.*

d. Gift *M. Norman reported that INS has received a gift of \$27,000 from a foundation in the Netherlands for the Matthews Fund. He expressed great gratitude for this generous gift.*

e. Upcoming Meetings

2021 Melbourne, Australia (in collaboration with ASSBI and CCN; Travis Wearne – INS Representative) *The board will hear a brief update on the meeting tomorrow.*

2022 New Orleans, USA, February 2-5, Marriott New Orleans (Co-Chairs Holly Miskey and Lucette Cysique) *There are no changes with the New Orleans meeting. Planning is proceeding as expected.*

2022 Mid-Year *M. Norman noted that the World Congress will not take place in 2022. INS is considering a midyear meeting some place in Europe, perhaps in Spain. A meeting in Austria could not be organized within the time frame.*

2023 Washington DC. USA, February 15-18 Marriott Washington, Wardman Park (Co-Chairs Deb Attix and Julie Bobholtz) *M. Norman reported that there has been a great deal of upheaval related to the hotel site. The owners of the property have declared bankruptcy and the status of the contract with Marriott is not clear at this point due to legal disputes. He will keep the Board apprised of developments.*

2023 Mid-year Meeting Taipei, Taiwan

2024 New York, USA, February 14-17, Marriott Marquis

2024 Mid-year Meeting TBD

f. Policies and Procedures Manual *M. Norman noted that he has a group helping him to work on the Policies and Procedures Manual which will be ready for board review at the next meeting.*

g. Office Update *M. Norman reported on the remarkable resilience of the office staff; he reminded the board that most staff members are hired through the U. of Utah. He noted that after this meeting, we will review staff roles because at this point there is not a good organization of responsibilities for the office to be the most efficient. M. Norman noted that the lease is up for the INS office space. We receive a good rate and there does not seem to be a benefit from moving at this point.*

h. New revenue streams/educational initiatives *M. Norman reported that we have a media outlet. We need to advertise and showcase our webinars and videos, particularly in the global arena.*

i. Program Chair Issue *M. Norman brought up the issue of having the same program chair for February and Mid-Year meetings and the INS by-laws say the program chairs should be separate persons. This issue is not a problem in the new by-laws but these have not been passed yet. M. Norman noted that the board would need to rescind the approval of the appointment. C. Rey-Cassery noted that since the World Congress is not*

taking place, this issue is moot. She also noted that the Board voted on appointing D. Attix as an INS representative to the planning committee of the World Congress, not as a program chair. V. Anderson confirmed that D. Attix was to serve as INS Scientific Program Representative to the World Congress.

j. Sponsorship of Navigating Neuropsychology *M. Norman reported that INS provided NavNeuro \$15,000 to support their podcasts with the provision that INS would receive 50% of fees collected for continuing education. He noted that INS only made \$3,200 last year and recommended that the Board reconsider this arrangement and not renew the agreement with NavNeuro as it stands. Many of the listeners of NavNeuro are young neuropsychologists or in training and have less of a need to obtain continuing education credits. The podcasts are free of charge to listeners.*

The Board discussed different issues related to the NavNeuro arrangement which has not been productive for INS. The number of episodes suitable for CE credit was lower than expected. Issues discussed included aligning our business model more effectively, quantifying other benefits of collaboration with NavNeuro such as attracting early career members, connecting with the global neuropsychology community, and appreciating the popularity of the podcasts with students/trainees. The board discussed possible financial arrangements, such as providing \$5,000 in support. There was concern expressed that even this amount is more than what is often allocated to our own committees. The consensus was that the conversation around ongoing collaboration with NavNeuro needed to be continued and the board would like them to come back to INS with a more favorable proposal.

Motion 1: Move to communicate with NavNeuro that INS is not going to renew the existing contract and would be happy to engage in dialogue around how to collaborate in future

Motion by G. Smith

Seconded by I. Baron

Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed

4. Justice and Equity Task Force (Stringer)

Anthony Stringer joined the Board to provide an update on the work of the Justice and Equity Task Force. He provided highlights and noted that details are in the report submitted to the board. He commented that he had just come from a two hour conversation sponsored by the task force with neuropsychologists who identify as BIPOC.

The task force developed a primary proposal that is described in the report and the attached starting budget of \$10,000. He noted that the group had considered several models and felt that a clear mission was needed. The proposed initiative is the Brain Share Project that seeks to foster the development of training programs and of neuropsychology partnerships worldwide. This is an ambitious, multi-year project and the

intent is to obtain a seed grant. He expects to spend the next year in efforts to make this program sustainable. The proposed budget was provided to the board.

Discussion: J. Evans commented that the proposal fits in with the mission of the GEC and the Matthews Fund. He emphasized the importance of integrating efforts and continuing the yearly allocations to the Matthews Fund that supports one-time training workshops. A. Stringer noted that there could be some synergy across the two programs. S. McDonald wondered if the gift received for the Matthews Fund could be allocated to the Brain Share Program.

A. Stringer responded to questions from the board related to the project and other initiatives of the task force. He described the goal of making the Brain Share Project self-sustaining by seeking grants from foundations or other sources. He noted that it is an ambitious proposal and project that seeks to work together with different neuropsychologists in different international settings. A first step would be looking for commonalities in creating different models. He agreed that the program fits in well with the charge of the GEC. D. Byrd commended A. Stringer for his work in setting up the earlier meeting that engaged a span of individuals in an atmosphere of trust and addressed pipeline issues. A. Stringer noted that he respected the integrity of the board process and left the meeting so that the Board could deliberate on this proposal.

Board members discussed the Brain Share Project and implications for INS. This would be an ongoing commitment from INS. The challenges in addressing training issues across very different settings was raised given that in different countries one can practice with different degrees. The importance of integrating initiatives and not working in silos was emphasized; the program would be suited to be under the umbrella of the GEC. The general consensus of the Board was that this was a great initiative and that efforts should be made to find a way to integrate and support it.

Board members also raised some questions about the mandate of the Justice and Equity Task Force and how this proposal aligned with the charge of the task force. It was also difficult to make a decision about this proposal without first reviewing the budget and INS finances. M. O'Connor noted that the charge of the Justice and Equity Task Force was very broad and their efforts will address a range of areas in different projects. This project was presented first to the Board due to the financial implications.

5. Treasurer Report (Okonkwo)

O. Okonkwo introduced the Treasurer's Report by noting that he wished to cover several areas including changes to investment strategy, the financial status of the Society, the proposed budget, concerns about insecurity around revenue sources (membership dues), and bookkeeping issues related to how financial records are maintained and reported. Overall he noted that INS finances are in pretty good standing and we closed the year with 1.6 million which includes money in investments (1.3 million). We made some profit

from the Mid-Year Virtual meeting. Also, unlike former years, the Society did not have to dip into reserve funds to cover operating costs.

- a. **Investment update** *O. Okonkwo reviewed the investment plan with UBS. He noted that at the start of the COVID crisis, our portfolio took a substantial hit but with careful management and steps taken to address our losses, we ended up with some profit over the year. With respect to the investment portfolio, he reminded the Board of ongoing conversations with UBS over the past several years. The Board voted at the Rio meeting to split the investment portfolio into two funds with 75% remaining in a conservative approach and 25% would take a more aggressive approach, allocating 80% in equities and 20% in fixed income investments. At the Denver meeting, after conversations with the auditor and UBS, it was decided to postpone implementing this change. After discussions with UBS in December of 2020, the recommendation was that now was the time to go ahead with the plan. The overall level of risk is not going to change substantially, but INS will have the opportunity to maximize investment income. Board members questioned whether INS could pull out of the plan if things go badly. O. Okonkwo and others emphasized that in general, UBS is a very conservative company that has not advocated any particular agenda. He assured the Board that UBS would take immediate steps to mitigate losses. G. Smith noted that since we approved this plan before, the current question is whether the market has stabilized sufficiently now to put it into place. Board members also raised the question of the composition of our investment portfolio. O. Okonkwo noted that this has come up in a Finance Committee meeting and it has not been clear if and when the Committee should address this. Board members expressed a wish for transparency and understanding of where investments are placed. It was mentioned that there are firms that specialize in socially responsible investments.*

Motion 2: Move to authorize UBS to carry through with our revised investment plan that splits out our total monies into two funds: Fund 1 (conservative) and Fund 2 (more aggressive).

Motion by O. Okonkwo

Seconded by G. Smith

Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed

- b. **Current financial status** *O. Okonkwo raised some concerns related to how records are kept. He noted that the numbers do not add up correctly in the budget allocations and bookkeeping records. He noted that based on data reviewed, there appears to be a decline in membership dues over the last year and the Board needs to be concerned since this is a key source of revenue for the Society. The Board had questions related to how to understand this drop in light of the report that membership has been stable. M. Norman noted that there was*

a peak in membership in 2019 and now it is back down to former levels. Board members suggested that it would be important to review the make-up of membership dues and composition related to the fee structure. There was consensus that the Society needed to rethink how the budgeting is being done. M. Norman noted that our projected income seems favorable but the numbers do not add up. O. Okonkwo noted that the budget process was initiated earlier for this year than it has been done in the past, but it was still challenging to pin down accurate figures and projections. There was concern raised related to the fact that virtual meetings seem to be making a profit for the Society but that this could give us a false sense of security since the overall revenue is lower.

- c. Budget** *O. Okonkwo reviewed the budget and noted expenses are lower and proposed budget is lower than last year. The budget includes what the committees have requested with respect to support for this year. He raised the issue of whether unspent funds can be carried over to the next year. He noted that if a Committee has not spent its allocation, the proposed support for the next year needs to be reviewed and funds are not carried over. The Science Committee has a proposal to re-allocate the travel funds to fund more meeting registrations since there is no travel support needed for virtual meetings. The consensus of the board was that the travel funds were allocated for a number of individuals and could not be expanded or re-assigned. The Board consensus was that Committees could not re-purpose support that was approved for a particular activity. It was also mentioned that there should be some flexibility as it can take Committees time to organize initiatives and develop proposals.*

O. Okonkwo noted that what is missing from the budget is a true sense of projected revenue and this is critical to be able to meet expenditures. He noted that there is something wrong about how the reports are currently compiled in the budget.

The Board also discussed the request from the Justice and Equity Task Force. It was noted that if initiated, this would be a multi-year project and the Board should ask for long range planning information from the task force. O. Okonkwo noted that the task force was proposing something that was doable and concrete for the next year. The consensus on the board was that this project needed to be integrated with the GEC as efforts should be working conjointly.

With respect to approving the budget, the concerns around the issues with the budgeting process were discussed. G. Smith questioned whether provisional approval of the budget could be voted on and that a deadline could be set for review of actual revenue figures. M. Norman noted that the budget has traditionally been presented and approved at the February meeting, but the year has already started by the time the budget is approved. He noted that several

years ago, the office staff was expanded and budget preparation was brought in house. He noted that it has become clear that the office staff does not have the expertise to manage this and the auditors have noted that expected accounting rules have not been followed. M. Norman and O. Okonkwo noted that it will take time to address this issue and implement a new culture in the office related to managing revenues and expenses. M. Norman noted that this has been a longstanding issue and that INS will need qualified bookkeeping and accounting support. Board members agreed that there needs to be some mechanism for the Board to be kept apprised of budgetary issues so that any necessary changes or corrections can be made as needed. There was consensus that an overhaul of the budget process is needed.

Motion 3: Move to approve the composed budget for 2021

Motion by S. McDonald

Seconded by O. Okonkwo

Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed

- 6. Secretary Report (Rey-Casserly)** *C. Rey-Casserly noted that the Secretary Report is informational and summarizes minutes and board actions since the last meeting. There were some errors in dates which have been corrected. The following addendum to the Secretary Report was approved.*

Addendum to Secretary Report:

8. Approval of Appointment of the Chair of the Awards Committee

MOTION: Approve the appointment of Dr. Cynthia Honan as Chair of the INS Conflict of Interest Committee. Moved by Celiane Rey-Casserly. Seconded by Ozioma Okonkwo

Sent: 1/17/2021 Vote 14 Approve; vote completed 2/1/2021

M. O'Connor reviewed the plan for tomorrow's meeting. The Committee Chairs will participate in the first two hours of the meeting and the final hour of the meeting will be reserved for the Board to continue with items not addressed today.

M. O'Connor adjourned the meeting at 5:03 pm Eastern time.

February 2, 2020: Part 2

Present:

Officers: Margaret O'Connor (President), Skye McDonald (Incoming President), Ida Sue Baron (President-Elect), Ozioma Okonkwo (Treasurer), Celiane Rey-Casserly (Secretary), Marc Norman (Executive Director – Ex Officio)

Members at Large: Juan Carlos Arango Lasprilla, Miriam Beauchamp, Desiree Byrd, Robin Green, Ashok Jansari, Sarah MacPherson, Sanne Schagen, Glenn Smith, Mieke Verfaellie

Visitors: Jon Evans, Alberto Fernandez, Sallie Baxendale, Shawn McClintock, Fiona Kumfor, Anthony Stringer, Vicky Anderson

Committee Chairs:

Jonathan Evans (Global Engagement Chair), Edward de Haan (Publications Chair), Taylor Greif, (Student Liaison Committee Co-Chair), Taylor Jenkin (Student Liaison Committee Co-Chair), Derin Cobia (Education Committee), Lena Dobson (Science Committee Chair), Julie Bobholz (Membership Engagement Committee Chair), Melissa Lamar (Continuing Education), Benjamin Hampstead (Incoming Continuing Education Chair), Stephen Rao, JINS Editor, Roy Kessels (Awards Chair), Cynthia Honan (Incoming Conflict of Interest Chair), Natalia Ojeda (Incoming Global Engagement Committee Chair), Christian Salas (Awards Committee Chair), Molly Zimmerman (San Diego Virtual Conference Program Co-Chair), Amy Jak (San Diego Virtual Conference Program Co-Chair), Travis Wearne (Melbourne Mid-Year Meeting Co-Chair), Anna Egbert (Social Media Co-Chair), Emma Rhodes (Social Media Co-Chair)

Office Staff: Jamie Wilson, Administrative Coordinator and Bookkeeper, Katie Coffman, Registration Coordinator.

M. O'Connor opened the meeting at 2:00 pm EST

7. Introductions

M. O'Connor welcomed participants and all introduced themselves and their roles in the Society.

8. Communications from Day 1

M. O'Connor provided a summary of items and discussions from the first day of the board meeting. She noted that the Board received a report from the Justice and Equity Task Force. A. Stringer joined the board and described initiatives from the Task Force highlighting the Brain Share Project. The Board agreed that this needed to be integrated with other INS activities. The Board also discussed budget issues including a worrisome drop in dues revenue. She noted that there would be ongoing discussions with the membership committee. The Board also agreed that money not spent by a committee in one year could not be carried over to the following year. The Board discussed the ongoing sponsorship of NavNeuro. She reported that upcoming meetings are in the planning stages and that a site for the 2022 Mid-Year Meeting is under consideration. INS has also been involved in collaborative discussions across the world (Cameroon, United Arab Emirates). The Board also considered a request from the Cultural Neuropsychology Council. M. O'Connor praised the hard work of Marc Norman and the office staff.

9. Acknowledge Incoming BoG members and Chairs

M. O'Connor welcomed new members to the Board of Governors, Skye McDonald, President, Ida Sue Baron, Incoming President, Jon Evans, President-Elect, Alberto Fernandez, Secretary and incoming members at large, Sallie Baxendale, Shawn McClintock, and Fiona Kumfor. She also welcomed incoming Committee Chairs, Natalia Ojeda de Pozo (Global Engagement), Christian Salas Riquelme (Awards), Ben Hampstead (Continuing Education) and Cynthia Honan (Conflict of Interest).

10. Acknowledge BoG members and Chairs who are leaving

M. O'Connor acknowledged board members and committee chairs who are completing their terms. She commended C. Rey-Casserly for her historical memory and attention to detail and for keeping the Board and officers on track. She thanked her for her friendship and support. She acknowledged M. Verfaellie for her incredible scholarship and associate editorial work on JINS and her contributions to the Board. She remarked on M. Beauchamp's excellent work as Denver Meeting Program Chair, her humor and grace, and her amazing research in social cognition and child development. She noted A. Ansari's considerable expertise, good humor and always informative perspective on issues.

J. Evans is leaving the Global Engagement Committee to become President-Elect. He has worked so diligently and unfailingly on important partnerships and programs across the world. She commended R. Kessels for his identification of awardees around the world and his graceful and thoughtful presentations. She described M. Lamar as a divergent thinker who considers all angles in her research and commended her for her creativity and passion for education as well as her strong work on behalf of the Society. M. O'Connor noted looking forward to F. Kumfor's new role on the Board. M. O'Connor stated that she was proud to be colleagues with all and grateful for their important contributions to INS.

Introduction of Office Staff: M. Norman introduced the office staff and commended the staff for their commitment and dedication to the Society. Chantal Marcks is Director of Office Operations, Jamie Wilson handles emails and day to day finances, and Katie Coffman is helping out with registrations. Davis Schoenfeld is not in attendance today; he handles all the IT work. Mata Robinet has just joined the staff and works remotely from Toronto as Scientific and CE Program Manager.

11. Program chairs for SD meeting (Jak, Zimmerman)

A. Jak expressed her gratitude to the INS Office for all their help in supporting the meeting. She noted sadness about not hosting the meeting in person in San Diego. She reported that 810 abstracts were received which is lower than in past years but remarkable given the pandemic. She reviewed the structure of the meeting with seven invited plenary talks and four live symposia. Recorded programming will be released over the week. Continuing Education talks began today; CE will be available for the plenary talks. She noted that they tried to find ways for participants to engage in real time in the conference and office hours with speakers are offered. M. Zimmerman noted that the

meeting benefitted from a wonderful program committee. So far there are 1500 registrants and the virtual format opens the conference to many who may not have been able to attend.

12. Upcoming Conference (Wearne)

T. Wearne provided an update on the Melbourne conference which is jointly sponsored by the Australasian Society for the Study of Brain Impairment (ASSBI), the College of Clinical Neuropsychologists of the Australian Psychological Society (CCN) and INS. The conference will have a hybrid format with the expectation that individuals in Australia can attend in person. He reviewed international speakers lined up for the meeting (Anne Gordon, Sarah McPherson, and Neil Pliskin). There will be a debate on rehabilitation moderated by Barbara Wilson. The abstracts are due this coming Monday and T. Wearne requested that an announcement made to the INS community.

13. Committee Reports

- a. Publications (de Haan/Rao)** *E. de Haan noted that a procedure for the search and selection of a new editor for JINS needs to be devised. He reported that the Publications Committee now has broader representation. In addition, we need to prepare for assessment and renegotiation of the Cambridge contract. He noted that JINS is grouped together with neuroscience journals with respect to calculation of the impact factor, which is not favorable to JINS. He suggested that perhaps Cambridge can create a special group for us.*

S. Rao reported that the journal has been stable; the number of submissions has gone up and the rejection rate is a bit higher. The associate editorial board has been doing a great job. We have had a special issue on rehabilitation and one on cannabis is coming out. JINS is also adapting symposia presented at INS meetings and converting them to special sections. A special section on exercise and clinical outcomes is in preparation. There are meetings planned with marketing folks from Cambridge. The impact factor went down a bit this year. The anniversary issue was very well received but appeared late in the year. Special issues need to appear early in the year to have an influence on the impact factor.

Discussion: M. O'Connor asked how decisions were made regarding selecting special issue topics. A. Rao responded that there are regular meetings of the editorial board during which possible hot topics are discussed and possible co-sponsors of special issues are identified. The option of developing a student journal was discussed. E. de Haan noted that the Publications Committee is newly formed and has not come up with a plan. He noted that we want to energize young people in the field. A. Rao noted that in January, JINS acknowledges all the students who have been mentored as reviewers.

- b. Program Awards (Kessels)** *R. Kessels noted that this is his last meeting as Awards Committee Chair and provided an overview over the past 6 years. The Committee has worked on improving international representation in a positive way and increasing the number of awardees that are not from the US. He noted that there are still some countries that are not represented and it has been a major challenge to obtain nominations from all regions of the world.*

Discussion: M. O'Connor questioned if there were ways the process could be facilitated. R. Kessels noted that there may be cultural factors in that there may be reluctance to nominate individuals who are not well known names. The solution is to talk to people directly and provide encouragement to nominate.

- c. Student Liaison Committee (Greif/Jenkin)** *T. Greif reviewed the main SLC events in the program. There are 5 student abstract awards. The Committee has worked on global engagement and has been highlighting students in mini-webinars. The plan is to send out another call for abstracts for this. The Committee has also been working on releasing student spotlights and increasing following in social media. There is a student brochure that is a useful resource on the INS website which hopefully will increase membership. The Committee is seeking to recruit a GEC representative and would be grateful for any help in this regard. They also have created a new position for someone to work more closely with NavNeuro to curate more student/trainee oriented offerings. Overall goals of the SLC have been to increase access to neuropsychology knowledge around the world and to increase student memberships. A specific request from the SLC to the Board is to approve the SLC Co-Chairs' participation in the Clinical Neuropsychology Training Forum. The idea of the forum is to share resources and support common goals across organizations.*

Discussion: M. O'Connor and the Board members praised the wonderful work of the SLC. She noted that the Board has not had time to consider the SLC request and will discuss this later in the meeting.

- d. Science (Dobson)** *L. Dobson reported that the Science Committee has worked on adapting the travel awards to the virtual meeting format. They request the same amount of funding (\$5500) and to extend the awards to support more individuals for registration fees and one CE course since expenses for travel are not needed. The Science Committee is also developing a member directory that could be represented as a map of national and regional neuropsychology societies. The idea is that one can obtain information about organizations across the world and additional information could be submitted and posted. This may help in promoting awards in regions that are less active in neuropsychology. The Science Committee would like to have representation from every continent except Antarctica. The Brain Injury SIG has a proposal to create a sponsored membership program. There are many folks interested in joining the SIGs but*

cannot afford to join INS. The Committee also is requesting \$200 per meeting for the SIGs to be able to hold raffles with gift cards during their hour long socials. The SIGs also wondered whether it would be appropriate for two trainees to lead a SIG or would there need to be a regular member. They are looking forward to including language in the Policies and Procedures Manual regarding starting a SIG and to finalizing the document. There are now 9 SIGs and they have been very active. The Brain Injury SIG is participating in a collaborative webinar with the Dementia SIG that qualifies for CE credit.

Discussion: M. Lamar noted that if the SIGs want to host raffles, test publishers may be a source of support. She noted that the webinars have been great. M. Norman noted that requests for funding or support from publishers should be coordinated with the office. M. O'Connor questioned how the Science Committee identified individuals to support through travel grants. L. Dobson responded that numerous factors are taken into account. M. O'Connor asked about coordination across the SIGs and it was noted that there have not been any further meetings of the SIG leaders. Board members did not have a problem with having students serve as SIG leaders. M. O'Connor commended the work of the SIGs on the Policies and Procedures document.

- e. Education (Cobia)** *D. Cobia described three initiatives of the Education Committee, the video archive project, webinars, and collaboration with NavNeuro. He noted that the video archive project is going well and there are commitments from Daniel Schacter and Marsel Mesulam. There are several individuals on the list for prospective interviews. This is becoming a valuable resource that documents thought leaders in our field. The Education Committee has hosted two webinars and has one upcoming (neuropathology for neuropsychologists). There has been some discussion around collaborating with Alberto Fernandez around the joint INS-SLAN webinar series.*

Discussion: M. O'Connor asked about how the interest of members is being determined with respect to proposing webinars. D. Cobia noted that the Education Committee welcomed thoughts and comments. M. Lamar noted that the CE committee recommends speakers every year and only a few are selected so the Education Committee could collaborate in this regard. Also the SIG's could be contacted for recommendations. The issue of free trial memberships to the SIGs was also brought up.

D. Cobia reported that the Education Committee is working with the NavNeuro producers and brainstorming regarding topics and possible international themes. M. O'Connor noted that the Board is figuring out next steps in this relationship. G. Smith noted that it is important to consider a return on investment framework

in thinking about investing in different media platforms and activities such that the reach and outcomes of initiatives are evaluated.

- f. **Global Engagement (Evans)** *J. Evans reported that the GEC has added two members to the Committee. The GEC manages the Matthews Fund; a conference in Thailand was supported and there is a collection of lectures accumulated. The Botswana conference had to be postponed and is now taking place in April. The next funding cycle deadline is the first of May and J. Evans asked that all encourage colleagues to apply. The research and editing initiative has helped 11 people with journal articles. The book/journal depository is in a lull at the moment. The MOU task force has been charged with addressing how MOU's are developed and managed and has requested further discussion on this topic. An MOU with FANPSE was established. M. O'Connor thanked J. Evans noting that this will be a transition year and she welcomed N. Ojeda as Chair of the GEC.*
- g. **Membership Engagement (Bobholz)**
 - i. *Communications: J. Bobholz noted that there are two subcommittees under Membership Engagement that handle communications (Social Media, INS Newsletter) and that they have done an incredible job this year. The Social Media Committee maintains twitter and Facebook activities. The communication has been spotless with great coordination. Following has increased 30% over the last 6 months. Social Media also maintains a manual to help with coordination. Cady Block has done incredible work with the newsletter and four issues are planned for 2021.*
 - ii. *Membership Engagement: J. Bobholz noted that the Committee is being revived with new committee members and important goals to focus on including getting dues paid, reviewing membership categories, and recruiting members globally. She suggested that the membership section of the INS website be reviewed to highlight advantages of membership.*

Discussion: B. Hamstead noted that there could be some opportunities to work in CE credits as a membership benefit. JINS CE is a very good value and could help increase JINS readership. He noted he was planning to reach out to J. Bobholz to discuss these initiatives. A discussion ensued related to how to use CE as an incentive for joining INS. M. O'Connor asked how the Social Media Committee identifies topics to cover. E. Rhodes responded that they have a list in their manual of common topics to cover. They try to showcase opportunities or students, promote INS membership, highlight meetings and science from members, keep abreast of what is happening, and coordinate with the office around communications. A discussion ensued around how to coordinate and expand social media communications.

M. O'Connor thanked the Committee Chairs for their contributions to INS and the meeting. The Board then met without the Committee Chairs.

14. Issues to address from earlier meeting

- a. US Government Program** *M. Norman questioned whether the Board would like more information related to possibly applying to US government program that supports small businesses that have sustained losses in times of COVID. S. McDonald questioned whether INS business has suffered from COVID. There have been no lay-offs of staff. M. Norman noted that he was not sure INS was eligible for this.*
- b. Guarant arrangement-Vienna conference** *M. Norman reported that when the Vienna meeting was cancelled, Guarant had already put in some expenses for the meeting related to putting together the website and uploading of abstracts. According to the contract, INS is not liable for these costs but M. Norman suggested working out an arrangement with Guarant and he will update the Board on this.*
- c. SLC Request for approval to participate in Clinical Neuropsychology Trainee Forum (CNTF).** *M. O'Connor noted that this request seems very straightforward. Board members expressed the concern that lines of communication need to be well-delineated so that the Board is kept aware of what is happening. It was noted that it is important to support student initiatives and that the SLC has good instincts related to seeking consultation when needed. It was mentioned that the students should advance INS's international perspective and goals within the forum. The consensus was to approve SLC's participation to CNTF. M. Norman and S. Schagen will communicate the decision to the SLC and stress the importance of ongoing communication.*
- d. Justice and Equity Task Force request** *The Board discussed support for the Brain Share Project including budgeting strategies, relationship with the GEC and Matthews Fund activities, and sustainability. The need for coordination and specifying lines of reporting was emphasized. The consensus was that the Justice and Equity Task Force should be made into a subcommittee of the Global Engagement Committee to enhance coordination and collaboration on projects. It was important for funding sources to remain separate between the Matthews Fund and the Brain Share Project. The Board was very supportive of the project.*

Motion 4: Move to make the Justice and Equity Task Force a subcommittee of the GEC

Motion by D. Byrd

Seconded by S. McDonald

Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed

Motion 5: Move to appoint Anthony Stringer as Chair of the Justice and Equity Subcommittee

Motion by M. Verfaellie

Seconded by A. Jansari

Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed

Motion 6: Move to allocate \$10,000 to the Brain Share Project

Motion by S. MacPherson

Seconded by D. Byrd

Motion approved unanimously; all in favor, none opposed

15. Houston Conference Guidelines (Rey-Casserly)

C. Rey-Casserly summarized the inter-organizational request for INS to participate in the Planning Committee for a conference to review and update the education and training guidelines for the specialty of clinical neuropsychology (Houston Guidelines). Information about the request, options to be considered by INS, and a recommendation for participating in this initiative are summarized in the agenda material.

Discussion: S. McDonald noted that this was a really great idea. INS is a multidisciplinary society and its focus on neuropsychology science is of interest to other disciplines as well. She noted the importance to keep the boundaries wide and inclusive. J. Evans noted that this is an important initiative and there is a great deal of interest in education and training competencies internationally. Board members noted the importance of contributing INS's international perspective and that if we are not at the table for this we risk not being part of this important community. It would also be important to have international students be part of the delegates to the conference that is being planned. The importance of communicating with the Education Committee and the Board was emphasized.

Motion 7: Move to appoint two delegates to the Planning Committee for the Houston Conference-II, one from North America and one not from North America

Motion by C. Rey-Casserly

Seconded by I. Baron

16. Election Process and Changes in Presidential Tenure (McDonald)

S. McDonald presented issues that have developed around the election process that make it difficult for persons with non-English speaking backgrounds to be nominated for president. She suggested that the selection process needs to be more open and allow members to nominate candidates. She also raised the issue of putting two people up for president and that a great deal of thought goes into the selection process and after the election, one person gets excluded. She explored strategies for continuing to benefit from

this person's expertise and investment in INS, such as having them become members of the board. She also mentioned that INS could be more strategic in identifying regions around the world from where presidential nominees should be recruited to increase international participation in the process and in governance.

Discussion: The Board reviewed the current nominating process in which nominees are proposed and selected by the Nominating Committee and members have the opportunity to propose another candidate after the slate is created if they can put together endorsements from 40 members. The idea of offering a board position to the presidential candidate who does not win was discussed. This did not seem workable for several reasons including that it could be perceived as a demotion by the candidate who might not be interested in a board position. There were concerns about disenfranchising members because this process would take the leadership decisions out of the hands of the dues paying members. It was suggested that these candidates could be encouraged to run again for office. The Board was in favor of expanding member participation in the nomination process by having a call for nominations from membership early in the process. These nominations can then be reviewed by the Nominations Committee in their deliberations. It would also be important to engage more individuals in governance across the world.

17. Publication Endorsement Task Force (Baron)

I. Baron summarized the issue of people requesting endorsement from INS for position papers and guidelines. She reviewed the work of the task force charged with addressing this issue. She discussed the complexity of this topic. The Task Force concluded that endorsing papers from outside INS did not fit in with the mission of the INS. She outlined the number of steps and resources (financial, administrative, personnel) that would be needed to create a viable, internationally relevant, and scientifically valid structure for evaluating the merit of these requests. The Task Force concluded that the benefits to INS were not clear and there was not a good rationale for breaking INS's traditional neutrality vis-a-vis these requests. She noted that this complex issue needs to be addressed in greater detail and that these types of requests should be deferred until the board has this discussion. The special context of the SIGs was also discussed. It was recommended that if the SIGs wish to produce papers and seek endorsement of the INS, they need to come together to create a structure for this. The task force outlined the elements that would need to be considered in this type of initiative.

Discussion: The Board considered the range of issues engendered by engaging in endorsing papers and position papers. It was clear that the issues were complex and there was not enough time to engage in a thorough discussion. The issue of the SIGs was considered. It was noted that the SIGs need a certain amount of autonomy but the relationship with the larger organization needs to be considered when position papers are developed. The idea of having some kind of disclaimer was discussed. It was mentioned

that the SIGs are likely to be invested in collaborating on papers. I. Baron will communicate the Board's discussion to the SIG leadership.

18. MOU's (Fernandez and Evans)

A. Fernandez noted that this item will need more time for discussion that is not available today given all the issues the Board is dealing with. This item was postponed for the next meeting.

19. International Mentoring Initiative (Green)

This was deferred for the next meeting; R. Green reported that she has some data to be reviewed by the board.

20. Approval of New Budget Allocations

The Board approved \$10,000 for the Brain Share Project

21. Reminders of business meeting, past presidents' meeting, etc

22. Adjournment

M. O'Connor offered best wishes for the next year and adjourned the meeting at 5:38 pm EST.

Respectfully submitted,

Celiane Rey-Casserly, PhD
INS Secretary